

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

VINCENT CARL WOODS, JR.,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN, Federal Detention Center
SeaTac,

Respondent.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-02181-LK

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION

This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Brian A. Tsuchida. Dkt. No. 8. Having reviewed the R&R, the remaining record, and the applicable law, the Court adopts the R&R and dismisses Petitioner Vincent Carl Woods, Jr.’s habeas petition.

Mr. Woods has filed a petition for habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 alleging that Respondent refused to apply earned First Step Act (“FSA”) credits to his sentence. Dkt. No. 3 at 3. Respondent filed an answer and return, arguing that the Court should dismiss the petition “as not cognizable in habeas, for failure to exhaust administrative remedies or, in the alternative, as

1 not ripe for adjudication.” Dkt. No. 6 at 10. Among other things, Respondent argued that the Court
2 does not have jurisdiction over Mr. Woods’ claim that the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”)
3 miscalculated his PATTERN score or incorrectly assessed his risk of recidivism, leading to his
4 categorization as ineligible for FSA credits. *Id.* at 2, 4–6; *see also* Dkt. No. 7 at 2; Dkt. No. 7-1 at
5 4, 8. Mr. Woods did not respond to Respondent’s answer.

6 Judge Tsuchida issued his R&R on April 3, 2025 and recommended that this Court dismiss
7 the petition with prejudice because “the Court lacks jurisdiction over Petitioner’s claim the BOP
8 has miscalculated his PATTERN score and has incorrectly assessed his risk of recidivism, thereby
9 improperly denying him FSA early release credits.” Dkt. No. 8 at 5. Judge Tsuchida directed that
10 any objections had to be filed and served on all parties no later than April 17, 2025. *Id.* at 9. Mr.
11 Woods did not file any objection.

12 When considering Judge Tsuchida’s R&R, the Court “shall make a de novo determination
13 of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which
14 objection is made,” and “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
15 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P.
16 72(b)(3) (the Court “must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that
17 has been properly objected to”). As the statute and rule suggest, the Court reviews findings and
18 recommendations “*if objection is made*, but not otherwise.” *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328
19 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“Neither the Constitution nor the statute requires a
20 district judge to review, de novo, findings and recommendations that the parties themselves accept
21 as correct.”).

22 No objections having been filed, the Court ADOPTS Judge Tsuchida’s Report and
23 Recommendation, Dkt. No. 8, and DISMISSES with prejudice Mr. Woods’ habeas petition, Dkt.
24 No. 3.

1 The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to Mr. Woods at his last
2 known address.

3 Dated this 25th day of April, 2025.

4 

5 Lauren King
6 United States District Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24